



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

scripts name Judith with Esther after Daniel; cf. Zahn, *op. cit.*, p. 202). Judith is named in connection with and before Esther by Clemens Romanus, Cor. I, 55; in the lists of Dial. Timothei et Aquilae, of Junilius, of Ebedjesu, of the Council of Carthage (cf. also that of Codex Claromontanus), *vide* Swete *u.s.*, pp. 206 ff., Zahn, *u.s.*, *passim*. The attitude of the Vulgate in the matter is also interesting, Swete *u.s.*, p. 230, esp. note 1.

MARTIN SPRENGLING

WATERTOWN, WIS.

### MOFFATT'S NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION

A new Introduction to the New Testament by the Scottish scholar<sup>1</sup> Dr. James Moffatt forms an important contribution to the already extremely useful "International Theological Library." The standard of excellence set by Professor Driver of Oxford in his similar work on the Old Testament is amply maintained in the present volume. It is distinctly a treatment of the New Testament as literature, the problems of text and canon having been discussed by Professor Gregory, of Leipzig, in a separate volume of the same series. The compact "Prolegomena" considers such pertinent topics as the methods and materials of introduction, the arrangement of the writings, the literary sources of the New Testament, its literary forms, the circulation of the writings, and some of their literary characteristics. The main body of the book falls into five sections, as follows: "The Correspondence of Paul," "Historical Literature" (i.e., the first three gospels and Acts), "Homilies and Pastorals," the "Apocalypse," and a final chapter on the Fourth Gospel and I John.

In general the entire treatment is characterized by careful attention to details and full citations of the literature. Yet we are not given merely a miscellany of other writer's opinions. The relative merits of divergent views are often indicated, and they are estimated with reference to the author's own conclusions. Moffatt is an extensive compiler, but he is much more than a borrower. In a field which had already occupied so many scholars it was only necessary at many points to restate the conclusions of others, yet the author has not hesitated to go his own way on some problems which he felt needed further elucidation. On the whole it may be said that he has conserved the latest and most substantial results of modern scholarship, while also presenting a treatment in which his own mastery of the subject, and his independence

<sup>1</sup> *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.* By James Moffatt. New York: Scribner, 1911. xli+630 pages. \$2.50.

in handling it, are clearly felt. Whether he has given a final answer to any questions that were previously open remains to be seen; but he certainly has presented a fresh and vital exposition of the whole subject.

His conclusions regarding some of the disputed problems of New Testament introduction may be noted briefly. He accepts II Thess. as Pauline. The eschatological discourse of chap. 2 is thought not to be inconsistent with Paul's point of view, while the style and vocabulary of the epistle are found to present no insuperable difficulties for the traditional view of its origin. More noteworthy is Moffatt's advocacy of the North Galatian theory, in opposition to his fellow-countryman, Ramsay, and to a number of other scholars on both sides of the Atlantic. Regarding the perplexities connected with the Corinthian correspondence, Moffatt holds that Paul had visited Corinth but once prior to writing I Cor., but he made a second visit before writing II Cor. This visit had been a failure, so far as quelling the disturbance was concerned, and on returning to Ephesus Paul contemplated a third trip but finally decided to write a letter instead. This was a sharp epistle which produced the desired effect, and it is now to be found in II Cor. 10:1—13:10. II Cor., chaps. 1—9, came last in the correspondence. Rom. 16:1—23 is held to be originally a fragment intended for Ephesian readers. The rest of this letter came, in substantially its present form, from Paul. Colossians is also Pauline and has not undergone, as some think, any extensive process of re-editing. Philemon and Philippians are the only remaining writings of the apostle in our canon, and these, like Colossians, were written during his imprisonment in Rome.

The problems of synoptic criticism are clearly stated, but Moffatt's own conclusions are not always convincing. The writings of Matthew and Mark, mentioned by Papias, are identified with "Q" and an *Urmarcus*, respectively. It was not the latter, however, but our canonical Mark, which the authors of Matthew and Luke used. The original "Q" is found more accurately preserved in Matthew than in Luke. In fact it is almost a blanket-document for all the non-Markan material of Matthew except the infancy narratives. In Luke, on the other hand, "Q" has been broken up and rearranged at will—a remarkable contrast to the way in which the same evangelist employed his Markan source! The peculiar section in Luke 9:51—18:34 is thought to have been in no sense a formal source but is the evangelist's own product "partly drawn from special traditions of the Judean ministry of Jesus, partly from Q, and partly even from Mark." The author of Luke-Acts was Luke the physician and companion of Paul. He had kept a diary

while traveling with the apostle at various times during the decade 55-65 A.D. but not until 80-90 did he write the gospel bearing his name, while Acts was written about 100 A.D. Several of these conclusions are likely to be rejected by many New Testament scholars.

First Peter, Jude, II Peter, Ephesians, the two letters to Timothy, Titus, Hebrews, James, II and III John are classed as "Homilies and Pastorals." Peter and Silvanus are together the authors of I Peter, which was written at Rome soon after 64 A.D. and carried by Silvanus to certain communities in Asia Minor. Jude belongs in the early decades of the second century, and II Peter is from a still later date. Ephesians is an irenical pamphlet composed by a Paulinist after the model of Colossians and addressed to no community in particular—vs. 1 originally contained no place-name—but was designed for general reading. The letters to Timothy and Titus are of the same pseudonymous character. They may contain a few private notes of Paul's, but no confidence is placed in any of the proposed reconstructions of the genuine parts. Hebrews is called "a unique specimen of Alexandrian thought" composed about 80 A.D. and addressed to some group of Christians in Rome or in Italy. Moffatt refuses to speculate on the problem of authorship. The Epistle of James is regarded as the work of some Christian teacher of the late first or early second century whose "horizon is ecumenical Christendom." II and III John are assigned to John the Presbyter of Asia mentioned by Papias, and the epistles were written early in the second century.

The Book of Revelation is thought to be from the same hand as II and III John, but a decade or so earlier. The Fourth Gospel and I John are of unknown authorship, and are to be dated in the period 100-115 A.D. They are not apostolic works, for the tradition of the Apostle John's early martyrdom by the Jews is accepted. The gospel has indeed a literary history, though doubt is cast upon all the different theories proposing any detailed literary analysis. John the apostle may conceivably be identified with the "beloved disciple," and he may have been authority for some of the special sayings and traditions in this work, but he is in no real sense the author. The actual writer's name is quite unknown. The same person may have composed I John, though probably it was another individual who shared a very similar style of thinking and wrote somewhat later for readers familiar with the doctrine of the Fourth Gospel if not with the gospel itself.

On the side of mechanical execution the present volume has some defects. The type is occasionally indistinct—it had to be small in

order to crowd so much material into a single book—and the proof-reading, which to be sure must have been extremely difficult, is not all that could be desired. A more detailed table of contents and a fuller list of “subjects and references” would have facilitated the use of the volume as a work of reference, a purpose to which its contents are admirably adapted. But it is doubtful whether there exists at present in any language a discussion of the literary problems of New Testament introduction which, in importance and for general utility, excels or even equals Moffatt’s work.

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

### THE CONSTITUTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLY CHURCH

There has been no debate in the field of church history within the last twenty years more fruitful than that between Harnack and Sohm over the charismatic organization of the church, a debate recently continued by Harnack’s rejoinder,<sup>1</sup> to Sohm’s *Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus*, 1909, itself a criticism of the position taken by Harnack in his article, *Kirchliche Verfassung und kirchliches Recht im I. und II. Jahrhundert* in the third edition of the *Realencyklopädie*, 1908, which, reprinted with some additions, takes up pages 1-120 of the volume under review. In the course of this debate during which each of these great scholars has derived much from the stimulating criticism of the other, one fact has been brought out with ever-increasing clearness, namely, that in the body of the Jewish traditions, claimed as their inheritance by the Christians from the very beginning on, is to be sought the distinctive principle or principles of the unique development of the Christian organization; further and more specifically, that in the Jewish conception of their nation as the people of God, and the application of this and allied conceptions made by the Christians to themselves is to be found the most illuminating explanation of the institutional development of the followers of Christ. That is to say, the Christians, thinking of themselves as the people of God, the *ecclesia*, failed to distinguish between the ideal,

<sup>1</sup> *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten*. Von Adolf Harnack. Nebst einer Kritik der Abhandlung R. Sohms *Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus*, und Untersuchungen über “Evangelium,” “Wort Gottes,” und “Das trinitarische Bekenntnis.” Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910. xi+252 pages. M. 6.60.